

Association News

“(Color) Blind Justice?: An Examination of Racial Bias in Imposition of the Death Penalty.” \$1,500.

John E. Peterson, Unaffiliated. “The Modernization of Tradition: Political Change in the Arabian Peninsula.” \$1,500.

John J. Pitney, Jr., Claremont McKenna College. “The Republican Party in the U.S. House Project.” \$1,050.

James Pletcher, Denison University, “Public Intervention in Agricultural Markets in Malaysia.” \$1,500.

Doh C. Shinn, Sangamon State University. “Public Perceptions and Commitments to Political Democracy in Korea.” \$1,500.

Gary D. Wekkin, University of Central Arkansas. “Political Parties, Federalism, and Public Policy.” \$775. □

Annual Meeting: Herring and Waldo To Be Honored; Plenaries to Include Posner and Frank

Pendleton Herring, former president of both the APSA and the Social Science Research Council, has been named the winner of the Madison Award. The Madison Award, the highest accolade of the Association, is given every three years to a living American political scientist who has made a distinguished scholarly contribution to political science. Herring will deliver the Madison lecture, “Politics: A Retrospective View,” at 5:30 p.m. on Friday, September 4.

Dwight Waldo, professor emeritus of the Maxwell School, Syracuse University, has been selected as the second John Gaus lecturer. The Gaus Lecture was established to honor a scholar who best embodies the joint tradition of political science and public administration, and, more generally, to recognize achievement and encourage scholarship in public administration. Waldo will deliver his lecture, “A Theory of Public Administration Means in Our Time a Theory of Politics

Also,” at 5:30 p.m. on Thursday, September 3.

Evening plenary sessions will feature:

- Thursday evening—Presidential address, “One Soul at a Time: Political Science and Political Reform,” by Samuel P. Huntington, Harvard University, preceded by the APSA award ceremony.
- Friday evening—“The Constitution, Property Rights and the Welfare State” with participants including Frank I. Michelman, Harvard University School of Law, Richard A. Posner, U.S. Court of Appeals, and Martin Shapiro, University of California, Berkeley.
- Saturday evening—“The Constitution and Foreign Affairs” with participants including U.S. Representative Barney Frank and John Norton Moore, University of Virginia Law School.

Over 650 panels on a variety of topics have been scheduled for this 63rd annual meeting at the Palmer House in Chicago September 3-6. One of the panels will be a roundtable on the politics of AIDS and will include as a participant, C. Everett Koop, U.S. Surgeon General. □

Program Plans for 1988 Annual Meeting

John Ferejohn and **Stephen Krasner**
Stanford University

As organizers of the convention we have not tried to impose a theme on individual sections. Rather, we have encouraged the section chairs to define their own intellectual agendas. We expect that this will result in a program at least as vibrant as one that could be generated around a specific theme. The panels described below reflect the range of substantive interests and theoretical approaches that inform contemporary political science. We hope that the program will generate not just something for everybody, but something good for everybody.

Policies and Deadlines

Paper proposals and offers to appear as discussants or panel chairpersons must be submitted as early as possible. The deadline for receipt of submissions is December 1, 1987. Proposals for whole panels are welcome, but persons with suggestions for panels should get their requests in early.

Please write directly to the appropriate section chairperson listed below. More general inquiries or suggestions may be addressed to:

John Ferejohn or Stephen Krasner,
Department of Political Science, Stanford University, Stanford, CA 94305;
(415) 497-1806.

Ann Peyser, APSA, 1527 New Hampshire Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20036; (202) 483-2512.

Prospective participants should be aware of two APSA Council policies which will be enforced by the Association: (1) acceptance of a proposal by the Program Committee obligates you to preregister (with appropriate fee) prior to June 1, 1988. If you fail to preregister, you will not be listed in the final program; (2) you may serve on no more than two panels of the official program organized by the Program Committee. However, you may serve as a paper author on only one panel of the official program. This rule applies only to participation on the panels organized by the Program Committee and does not affect participation on panels organized by APSA Organized Sections, APSA Committees or "unaffiliated groups."

You may offer to participate in panels in several sections. However, if you receive invitations for more than one paper presentation, you may only accept one of them. You may not appear on more than two official panels, irrespective of the nature of the participation. If you do apply to several sections, please inform each section chairperson that this is a multiple application. Also, in that case, please notify the other section chairpersons as soon as you have accepted an invitation for participation in another section.

Section 1. Political Thought and Philosophy: Historical Approaches. Jerry Weinberger, Department of Political Science, South Kedzie Hall, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI 48824-1032; (517) 353-3280.

In the absence of an overarching convention theme, I welcome a broad range of proposals. However, I would like the section to be divided into three general categories, which together will reflect the "historical" approach without assuming too much about the tradition and without neglecting substantive philosophical problems. First, some panels should focus on the major figures of political thought from Plato to present times, possibly including medieval theorists, from whom the convention has not heard in quite some time. Papers might treat specific works, consider particular themes, or evaluate established and rival interpretations. If the panel does not concern a single theorist, it should nevertheless treat members of the same family or kind, whether it be temporal or substantive. Second, some panels should consider aspects of the tradition of political thought considered as a whole—how, why, and whether it is constituted as historical; its weight upon contemporary analytical and critical theory (or vice versa); the importance of one of its elements for political practice; and so on. Some panels in this category might focus on the meaning of concepts such as secularization, modernity, and post-modernity. Third, some panels should consider the relationship between arguments from the history of political thought and recent currents in moral philosophy, liberal and democratic theory, or Marxism.

The section should reflect fully the diversity of viewpoints and the vigor of controversy within its ken: while I will keep an eye on the three categories mentioned, they are not meant to discourage the suggestion of good ideas that might not seem to fit one of them. Proposals for specific papers, and offers to serve as discussant, are as welcome as are proposals for whole panels. Depending on the topic proposed, a panel should consist of two or three papers and one or two discussants. Of course, I also hope

Association News

to receive suggestions for roundtable discussions among scholars who have written on a particular topic.

Section 2. Normative Political Theory.

Joshua Cohen, Department of Political Science, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA 02139; (617) 253-5262.

Panels in this section will address a diverse range of issues in political theory. While the final structure of panels will depend on the papers that are submitted, I would particularly like to encourage papers on three topics: (1) the justification of democratic order, (2) the scope and limits of rational choice explanations, (3) variants of and criticisms of contemporary social contract theory.

Section 3. Formal Political Theory.

Randall Calvert, Department of Political Science, University of Rochester, Rochester, NY 14627; (714) 275-7252.

This section will focus on new developments in mathematical modeling and deductive theory, both positive and normative in focus. The papers in these panels should involve techniques or results that are of interest to the broader audience of formal theorists outside any particular substantive subfield. Accordingly, panels will be organized along the lines of theoretical, rather than substantive, content. Tentatively, these include: bargaining models, collective choice processes, decisionmaking under incomplete information, dynamic models and simulations, experiments in rational choice, institutions and political decisions, repeated games and cooperative behavior, and social choice theory.

Section 4. Methodology.

Larry Bartels, Department of Political Science, University of Rochester, Rochester, NY 14627; (716) 275-7840. Henry Brady, Department of Government, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA 02138; (617) 495-2516.

This section is open to proposals reflecting the broad spectrum of methodologies employed in political research, including statistics, historical analysis, field observation, experimentation, simulation, sur-

vey research, depth interviewing, and artificial intelligence. Papers should deal with issues of measurement, inference, and theory-building within each of these areas, or with systematic comparisons of alternative methodologies. Papers aimed at the development and interpretation of research methods will be preferred to those simply applying well-known techniques in standard ways.

Section 5. Competing Approaches to Political Science.

Peter A. Hall, Center for European Studies, Harvard University, 5 Bryant Street, Cambridge, MA 02138; (617) 495-4303.

The purpose of this section is to compare and assess a number of divergent theoretical approaches to the empirical problems of contemporary political science. Some panels may focus on divergent approaches within sub-fields, such as political development, international relations, American politics, electoral studies, or the comparative politics of a particular region, while others will consider competing theoretical perspectives that stretch across the discipline as a whole. In some cases, it would be interesting to assess how far a sub-field has moved beyond a powerful earlier paradigm, such as the Michigan model in voting studies, the Lowi taxonomy of public policy-making, or pluralist approaches to the explanation of government behavior, and in what direction this movement has been most fruitful. In other cases, a panel might compare the accomplishments and limitations of still-emerging approaches, such as state-centered versus regime-centered analyses of international relations, corporatist analyses of interest intermediation, neo-institutionalist approaches to comparative politics or state-building and historical analyses of American politics. Alternatively, a panel could consider competing methodological approaches to a common set of problems, such as the transition to democracy, the development of the welfare state or congressional behavior. There is room here to consider the insights that recent work in other disciplines, such as history or anthropology, contribute to emerging paradigms in political science. Preference will be given to papers that compare

competing approaches and test them against concrete empirical cases. I particularly welcome suggestions for whole panels whose papers address a common subject from a range of different approaches and panels that bring together scholars whose work is not often considered in the same context.

Section 6. History in Political Science.

Amy Bridges, Department of Government, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA 02138; (617) 495-2241.

In the last several years political scientists have rediscovered the analytic uses of history. Historical investigations have not been confined to any particular approach or subfield. For example, political development theorists have replaced long standing presumptions about "tradition" with a concern for the particular histories of various regions of the Third World. Scholars of the First and Third Worlds alike have traced the effects of different political and legal environments on economic development, relied on social histories to illuminate the political expectations of popular groups, and explored the historical causes and consequences of various paths of state formation. Students of political development of the United States have been attentive to the effects of electoral arrangements on politicians' career patterns and on the organization of social forces. Finally, those who study foreign policy are examining politicians' reliance on history and historical analogy.

Section 7. Comparative Politics of Developing Areas. Joel D. Barkan, Department of Political Science, University of Iowa, Iowa City, IA 52242; (319) 335-2337.

Proposals for panels and papers may be on any substantive topic or theme, but will be especially welcome when they approach their subject from a theoretical and comparative (including longitudinal and intranational as well as cross-national) perspective. Proposals are also encouraged (but not limited to) that address one or more of the following aspects of peasant political economy: peasant-state relations, rural-urban linkages, the differential political outcomes

of uneven (i.e., urban/rural, rural/rural) economic development, the politics of agricultural development policy, rural class formation, the politics of the landless, migration, grassroots organizations and movements, religious fundamentalism, the impact of the international economy and/or foreign economic policy on the peasantry, the political economy of refugees.

Proposals should include a statement of (1) the research questions to be addressed, (2) the anticipated findings and/or arguments to be made, and (3) a brief description of the methodology and data on which the paper is to be based.

Section 8. Developing Areas and the International System.

Ernest Wilson, Department of Political Science, 5601 Haven Hall, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI 48104; (313) 763-4212.

The panels in this section will explore the intersection of domestic and international politics (and political economy) in underdeveloped countries. At a minimum panels should include papers drawn from a variety of geographic areas, and/or papers employing a variety of methodological approaches. Especially welcome will be papers and panels that actually compare and contrast the intersection of domestic and international politics in two or more countries or two or more sectors.

Theoretical and methodologically oriented panels are encouraged. For example, one might debate and demonstrate ways that comparativists and world politics scholars can, should or cannot move across levels of analysis.

Also encouraged are political economy panels that propose to disaggregate and distinguish carefully between international *market* transactions and international *political* transactions, and that try to explain the extent to which politics that flows from them differs from sector to sector or market to market.

Section 9. Comparative Politics of Advanced Industrial Societies.

Peter Lange, Department of Political Science, Duke University, Durham, NC 27706; (919) 684-2916.

Association News

The panels in this section will give priority to institutions: as products of political interactions, as factors which structure political inputs and processes and as factors which contribute to the explanation of policy outputs and outcomes in the advanced industrial societies. The purpose will be to promote interactions between those interested in more and less formal analyses of institutions, that is, between the so-called "new institutionalism" and the focus on institutions long characteristic of comparative politics.

The notion of institutions is to be understood very broadly. It can range from the general structure of the political system or the national constitution to the particular rules of a legislature or bureaucratic entity, from the degree of centralization of the national trade union movement or banking system to the rules which govern the access of politicians and political parties to the mass media and via them, to voters. As this latter suggests, the role of institutions as constraints on or determinants of individual political behavior is welcome. A panel devoted to the conceptual and theoretical problems posed by a focus on institutions is also encouraged.

Panels should seek to promote the comparison of institutions—as independent, dependent or constraining variables—across different settings. These settings can range from the subnational—regions, states and the like—to cross-national comparisons (including the United States among the advanced industrial societies). It would be particularly desirable to have one or more panels which compare institutions in democratic and non-democratic advanced industrial societies. Panels which seek to compare institutions with similar structural characteristics but different functions are also encouraged.

Section 10. Domestic Politics and Foreign Policies of Communist and Authoritarian Regimes. Dina R. Scheppler, Department of Political Science, Indiana University, Bloomington, IN 47405; (812) 335-1208.

This section is intended to promote the

comparative analysis of the domestic politics and foreign policy behavior of communist and other authoritarian regimes. Individual papers may focus on the behavior or institutions of a single regime or country, but an effort will be made to select papers and construct panels which facilitate comparison. Papers dealing with the linkages between internal political processes or structure and external conduct are especially encouraged, as are papers which discuss the utility of alternative models or approaches to the study of politics and political change in communist and authoritarian systems, or competing theories of the nature and sources of foreign policy in such systems. Comparisons of political processes, culture, and institutions in authoritarian and democratic polities are also welcome, as are similar comparisons designed to identify and explain distinctive characteristics of the foreign policy behavior of communist or other authoritarian regimes.

Section 11. Politics and Economics. Ronald Rogowski, Department of Political Science, University of California, Los Angeles, CA 90024; (213) 825-1385.

While this rubric can accommodate any penetrating investigation of the mutual relationship of political and economic variables, panels on three broad topics will be especially welcome.

(1) Sources and consequences of rent-seeking activity. Expanding on the contributions of Krueger, Olson, Tullock, Bhagwati, and others, papers on this subject might examine the importance of rent-seeking for political instability and violence or for economic growth and innovation; or they might address its alleged causes, including level of economic development, state institutions and ideology, or economic openness. (Needless to say, proposals to examine rent-seeking by academics, or to treat the APSA as a rent-seeking enterprise, will be rejected out of hand.)

(2) Extensions of economic theory and approaches to the study of politics. This heading should afford ample scope to our discipline's inveterate pursuit of intellectual arbitrage; i.e., the taking of "long"

positions in cognate fields' devalued theoretical stocks just before their anticipated rise in our own. Recent fruitful examples include treatment of the state as monopolistic vendor of property rights, the principal-agent perspective and the "new organization theory" more generally, and certain applications of trade theory.

(3) Determinants and effects of governmental economic policies. Here such issues as inflation, exchange-rate and tariff policies, the extent and categories of public expenditure and taxation, and industrial planning can be addressed. Of particular interest will be panels that treat such topics comparatively, or that focus on their international aspects.

Section 12. Race, Gender and Ethnicity in Comparative Perspective. Paula D. McClain, School of Public Affairs, Arizona State University, Tempe, AZ 85287; (602) 965-3926. Mitchell Rice, Public Administration Institute, Room 3171-CEBA, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, LA 70803; (504) 388-6743.

Clearly, the title of this section covers a broad intellectual spectrum with a variety of theoretical foundations and perspectives. Moreover, each one of these areas subsumes a myriad of topical areas. It is our intention to organize panels which examine the issues of race, gender and ethnicity in American politics from a comparative perspective—either within groups or across groups. Of particular interest are panels and papers which examine: (1) the interdependence of race, class and gender; (2) the concepts of race, gender and ethnicity as organizing principles for political activity; (3) the development of political interests and social formation or the representation of these interests from one or more of these perspectives; (4) the relationship of race, gender and ethnicity to participation in political and public institutions; and (5) conceptual and methodological issues related to conducting research in these areas. Our intent is to be as inclusive as possible, therefore, proposals reflecting theoretical and epistemological concerns are welcome and encouraged. Addition-

ally, we will consider papers which examine concepts from an international focus.

Section 13. Legislative Process and Politics. Sandy Maisel, Department of Government, Colby College, Waterville, ME 04901; (207) 873-1131. After August 31, 1987: Department of Government, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA 02138.

Scholars writing in the field of legislative process and politics have written on a wide range of issues in recent years. While not restricting proposals, I would especially like to encourage those who are suggesting panels or panels which emphasize the interplay of process and politics. Obviously, these suggestions can cut into the topic at any point—from recruitment and elections, through institutional development and change, to relationships with others in and out of government, and finally to policy outcomes. A wide variety of panels will be offered; thus, a similar variety of proposals are sought.

Section 14. Executive Politics. Samuel Kernell, Brookings Institution, 1775 Massachusetts Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20036; (202) 797-6000.

The panels in this section will chiefly examine current scholarship on the American presidency and on generic executive politics. Proposals for papers that concern governors and mayors within the context of state and local politics should be submitted to the sections on state and local politics or federalism. While the individual panel topics will be governed by the desire to accommodate as many proposals as possible, I am especially interested in stimulating consideration of the following topics:

(1) The rise of special prosecutors in presidential politics. What explains this phenomenon, and current administration officials notwithstanding, how might it be expected to alter the ways White House officials deal with each other and the president?

(2) The development of the modern White House Office, both organizationally and its role in presidential leadership.

(3) The mechanics of assembling governing coalitions from the Oval Office. What are the alternative avenues of leadership available to the modern president? How do they shape his relations with other institutional actors in Washington? And importantly, how have the mechanics of leadership changed over the past half-century?

(4) A retrospective on the Reagan presidency. Will Ronald Reagan cast a shadow over future presidents?

Section 15. Federalism and Intergovernmental Relations. John E. Chubb, Governmental Studies, Brookings Institution, 1775 Massachusetts Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20036; (202) 797-6065.

For roughly a decade the federal system has been moving—more swiftly in some areas than others—in a new direction: generally speaking, it has been decentralizing. This has generated a lot of attention, of course. And, it has rekindled intellectual excitement in the field. But it has not yet produced significant changes in the ways in which political scientists think about and study the federal system. Complexity remains the system's defining characteristic and "thick description" the preferred way of examining it. This may well be appropriate; hence, papers that build on any of the field's recent traditions are welcome.

Still, I want especially to encourage those papers, sparked by the federal system's turnaround, that offer alternative conceptualizations of federalism research or that employ non-traditional methods. For example, what are the dynamics of decentralization—why has it followed its particular course and where is it probably heading? What systematic differences should we expect from the performance of a more decentralized federal system? How does decentralization alter the context of state and local politics? Is there anything to be gained from resurrecting the concept of federalism as an institution, as a definable structure with clear consequences? Are there useful applications for any of the theoretical tools that have worked with some effectiveness in related fields, for example, principal-

agent models of hierarchies, positive theories of institutions, or the more familiar economic conceptions of intergovernmental competition and subnational fiscal choice. On a related note, can any of the questions of concern to political scientists be answered more confidently with the econometric methods and large data sets that have provided consistent results when applied to problems of economics? One final preference: papers that (perish the thought) recommend ways for the federal system to decentralize—or recentralize or go through some combination of the two—more effectively.

Section 16. Public Opinion and Political Psychology. Stanley Feldman, Department of Political Science, University of Kentucky, Lexington, KY 40506; (606) 257-7050.

This section is intended to cover a variety of topics ranging from the nature of public opinion and its impact on government and public policy to studies of attitude structure, belief systems and the effect of personality characteristics on political behavior. Proposals may deal with the traditional topics associated with the study of public opinion and political psychology such as belief systems, the sources of political attitudes (i.e., family, media, peers), political learning, political ideology, and public opinion on specific issues. In addition, I encourage proposals concerning less conventional topics such as political cognition, symbolic politics, the psychological bases of mass movements, attitude dynamics, and political values. Proposals on methodological issues in the study of public opinion and political psychology will be given close attention.

Suggestions regarding panels on the subjects above or any other topics relevant to this section are welcome and will receive serious consideration. All proposals should include a statement of the topic to be investigated, the preliminary hypotheses to be tested, the data to be employed, and the theoretical and methodological approaches to be adopted. Such detailed information is necessary to develop coherent panels. Individuals with

suggestions for panel themes are encouraged to submit their ideas early to allow time for panel development.

Section 17. Public Law and Judicial Politics. R. Shep Melnick, Department of Politics, Brandeis University, Waltham, MA 02254; (617) 647-2902.

I would like to encourage panels in two broad areas. The first is study of the Constitution. The Bicentennial has spawned a large number of conferences and research projects on the American Constitution. The 1988 APSA Annual Meeting as well as the 1987 Annual Meeting can benefit from this extensive work. Those who have participated in successful conferences on the Constitution should consider putting together roundtables which allow those discussions to continue. Panels which bring together political scientists, historians, and lawyers can be particularly enlightening.

The second area is examination of relations between the courts and other political institutions. How has judicial activism in the U.S. affected Congress, the presidency, the bureaucracy, and the states? How have the courts changed public policies? To what extent do courts in other Western countries play a similar policymaking role?

Section 18. Bureaucracy. Thomas H. Hammond, Center in Political Economy, Box 1208, Washington University, St. Louis, MO 63130.

Studies of the bureaucracy can be classified as those which deal primarily with the *internal* aspects of bureaucratic life, those which deal primarily with the *external* aspects of bureaucratic life and those which deal with the *interaction* between external and internal aspects. I would like to organize panels around each of these three themes. For example:

Internal aspects: The incentive systems which motivate subordinates to do what superiors want are not well understood. To what extent can incentive systems be effective in public bureaucracy? One aspect of this control problem involves the fact that subordinates may also be trying to control, or at least avoid being controlled by, their superiors. Who has

the upper hand in this two-way game of control? Furthermore, studies of formal structure ("who reports to whom?") often neglect the incentive systems ("who gets paid for what?"), while studies of incentive systems often neglect the formal structure. Can these be integrated in some fashion?

External aspects: A central theoretical question here is, how "should" (in some rational choice sense) bureaucracies respond to their environments? The obvious empirical question is, how do they respond? Relationships with oversight institutions are particularly important. For example, how effective are parliamentary systems, as compared to separation-of-power systems, in exercising control over the bureaucracy?

The interaction: One possible question here involves the extent to which the external environment influences the organization's internal structure. A second question involves whether the organization's internal structure affects the organization's strategy for dealing with or manipulating its environment.

Many other areas of bureaucratic studies deserve representation, of course, and I do not expect to limit the set of panels to those discussed above.

Section 19. Campaigns and Electoral Behavior. Edie Goldenberg, IPPS, 440 Lorch Hall, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI 49109; (313) 763-2226.

The fall of 1988 is an obvious time to refocus scholarly attention on campaigns and elections. The organization, conduct and timing of political campaigns continue to change, and understanding the causes and consequences of these changes presents significant challenges to election scholars. Topics covered by this section include vote choice, mobilization and turnout, partisanship, campaign organization and finance, election reform, and the political and policy significance of electoral support. Comparisons of voting decisions in national and subnational settings and proposals linking context and vote choice are especially welcome. Suggestions for papers, roundtables, and panels are invited.

Section 20. Political Parties and Interest Groups. Michael J. Malbin, 500 Dartmouth Avenue, Silver Spring, MD 20910; (301) 585-2892.

Many years ago, I attended a lecture by Isaac Bashevis Singer. One student was fascinated by the *dybbuks* in Singer's stories and wanted to know if the Yiddish writer really believed that they existed. Singer responded. The student looked puzzled. "Did I answer your question?" "I am not sure." "Do you want to ask another?" "Yes." "Go ahead," said the author. "You ask the questions you want to ask, and I'll answer the questions I want to answer."

That is the way I feel about these paragraphs. We write what we want to write, and you will continue to do the research you want to do. After a few months, some of you will send paper proposals and we will put logical panels together based on what we actually receive.

I take it as a given that some people will be doing work on PAC and party finance, the internal dynamics of parties and interest groups, legal issues and rules. I would also be interested, however, in seeing (1) papers about parties and interest groups in government, (2) papers with historical or theoretical themes, and (3) papers that ask comparative questions. More than that, I cannot say. Let us see what you are doing.

Section 21. State and Local Politics. Harvey Tucker, Department of Political Science, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX 77843; (409) 845-2511.

A popular aphorism holds that "All politics are local politics." If this were an axiom of our discipline, a logical corollary might be "all political scientists are students of local politics." Empirically, few of us think of our interests in terms of local politics. However, many more of us could. Perhaps many more of us should.

This call for proposals for the state and local politics panels of the 1988 Annual Meeting is a broad invitation. Proposals dealing with state and local governments as units of analysis and/or state with local politics as a research focus are welcome, as always. However, I would also

welcome proposals to reconsider subjects normally approached from the "top-down" perspective of national politics. Perhaps the "bottom-up" perspective of national politics would provide useful insight into topics normally characterized as national or even international politics.

Paper proposals should provide as much information as possible, including the topic to be investigated, preliminary hypotheses to be tested, units of analysis, data sources, time frame and theoretical and methodological approaches. Proposals should also indicate the current status of the research project. Suggestions for roundtables or workshops are encouraged. Discussant volunteers should include a description of their research interests and qualifications.

Section 22. Public Policy. Daniel A. Mazmanian, Center for Politics and Policy, Claremont Graduate School, 160 East 10th Street, Claremont, CA 91711-6165; (714) 621-8000.

Public Policy panels will be organized to the extent possible around four major themes, though additional suggestions are welcome. (1) Theory building—normative and empirical—in the study of public policy. This can range from efforts at applying dynamic models of learning, sociobiology, gaming, etc., to the implications of policy studies for traditional concerns with democracy. (2) Development in the methodologies of policy analysis and the policy sciences, with emphasis on the comparative approach, variable specification, and measurement. (3) Assessment of the extent to which the contemporary focus on the policy process has affected the ways which political scientists view the political process and institutions of government. (4) Cross-national studies of the policy process.

Section 23. International Collaboration: Organization and Order. Karen Mingst, Department of Political Science, University of Kentucky, Lexington, KY 40506; (606) 257-7043.

Scholars of international collaboration have focused on a variety of collaborative processes including formal inter-

national governmental organizations, non-governmental organizations, trans-national processes, international law and negotiations, and international regimes. By studying each of these processes either singularly or across issue areas, scholars attempt to make theoretically informed generalizations about collaborative processes in the international system. Authors who have papers which address these theoretic concerns broadly are encouraged to submit abstracts.

In addition, a group of panels will focus specifically on contending approaches to international collaboration. Panel proposals might include the following: psychological approaches to international collaboration, historical bases of collaboration, economic theories of collaboration, legal approaches to international collaboration, socio-biological theories of collaboration, and functional approaches to international collaboration. Specific papers would assess the state of the research, including competing theoretic claims, the state of empirical studies, applications to specific problems, or future avenues of research. Individuals who wish to organize a panel around one of these themes are especially urged to write to me.

Section 24. International Conflict. Jack S. Levy, Univ. of Minn., Dept. of Pol. Sci., 1414 Social Sciences Bldg., Minneapolis, MN 55455; (612) 624-4144.

Research in the field of international conflict is too diverse to permit a focus on any one theme, and instead the aim will be to organize panels and roundtables representing some of the most theoretically innovative work in the field. Some possible topics for individual and panel proposals would include formal models of conflict, including recent research on bargaining, incomplete information, reputation, and risk orientation; theoretical, historical, and experimental analyses of the sources of international cooperation; theories of hegemonic war, including long cycle theory; crisis escalation and crisis management; alternative theories of deterrence; the use of force short of war; economic and domestic political models of international conflict and war;

the application of new methodologies, including artificial intelligence; and the impact of nuclear weapons on theories of international conflict. Possible topics for roundtables might include the contribution of research in other disciplines to theory-building in international conflict; conceptual and methodological problems in the study of war; and assessments of the contributions of certain major research programs on international conflict. Proposals for panels and individual papers on other topics are also welcomed. A reasonably descriptive abstract should be included.

Section 25. National Security. Michael Nacht, School of Public Affairs, University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742; (301) 454-6193.

Panels in this section will deal with a range of topics associated with national security. I would be particularly interested in proposals addressing issues related to the expectations and results of arms control agreements, low intensity conflict, congressional involvement in national security policymaking, ethical aspects of national security, arms and arms control in space, and the initiation of and reaction to surprise attacks.

Section 26. International Political Economy. Raymond F. Hopkins, Department of Political Science, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA 19801; (215) 328-8093.

Turbulent as well as smooth episodes in international politics associated with economic forces, either as causes or results, are appropriate subjects of papers for this section. I welcome proposals from those volunteering to serve as a discussant, to present a specific paper, or to organize an entire panel. Please send as clear a statement of your interest and purpose as possible.

Panel topics under this rubric can be quite diverse this year, as they have been previously. Methodology, theory, and major cause applications, such as international debt, may be the basis for organizing a panel. Some consideration to achieving diversity in panels across disciplines, national boundaries and gender will

Association News

affect the final composition of this section. Panels that connect the national with international political economy considerations would be especially worthwhile. Prescriptive papers and panels, based on research and analysis, are also welcome.

Section 27. Foreign Policy Analysis.

Elizabeth Crump Hanson, Political Science Department, Box U-24, University of Connecticut, Storrs, CT 06268.

This section will be devoted to systematic studies of foreign policy which are firmly grounded in the literature of international relations. It will cover domestic sources of foreign policy, decision-making, cognitive processes and other topics which have concerned foreign policy analysts. Because the bulk of the research in this area centers on the

United States, it is likely that a significant number of panels will have this focus.

Special efforts will be made for the 1988 meeting to expand foreign policy analysis beyond the American context. Particular attention will be given to panels which investigate within a comparative framework the influences and processes affecting foreign policy. Panels which combine the questions and findings of international relations scholars with those of area specialists are encouraged. Proposals which examine the applicability of models of foreign policy made in the U.S.A. to other states or which attempt to develop other explanatory approaches are also invited.

Suggestions for panel topics or themes are welcome. Send proposals for a paper or a full panel along with an abstract and curriculum vitae. □

APSA Organized Section: Law, Courts and Judicial Process Business Meeting

The APSA Organized Section: Law, Courts and Judicial Process will hold a business meeting on Thursday, September 3rd, at 5:30 p.m. at the Palmer House in Chicago, Illinois. This meeting is being held in conjunction with the 1987 APSA Annual Meeting and was inadvertently left out of the Preliminary Program in the Spring issue of *PS*.